

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 12-20 have been allowed. Applicants request reconsideration of the application in view of these remarks and arguments.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 3-7, 10-11 and 21-22 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but states that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the base claim and intervening claims are allowable as detailed below, thereby, rendering Claims 3-7, 10-11 and 21-22 allowable.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alanara, et al. (EP 448369A2) in view of Yacoob (USPN 6,170,742). Applicants traverse these rejections. Applicants submit that the combined teachings of Alanara, et al. and Yacoob do not render Claims 1-2 and 8-9 obvious because the combined teachings fail to teach or suggest the limitations recited in Claim 1 and included by dependency in Claims 2 and 8-9 of "checking the identification code against a list stored locally at the card acceptance location, wherein the list is received from a second device; and if the identification code of the smart card is listed on the list, performing an action on the smart card." The Examiner admits that Alanara, et al. does not disclose these limitations but argues that Yacoob does. Applicants disagree.

Applicants are unsure of where in col. 13, line 20 through col. 14, line 21 of Yacoob the Examiner believes the limitations of "checking the identification code against a list stored locally at the card acceptance location, wherein the list is received from a second device" are taught or suggested. Yacoob discloses a "terminal [that] facilitates primarily local and remote reading/writing to the smart card machine." Col. 14, lines 17-19. The only list mentioned in the passage cited by the Examiner is a "list of file identifiers." Col. 13, line 45. However, an identification code of a smart card would not be checked against this list because, as explicitly stated in Yacoob, "each file identifier [in the list] is associated with a communications link specification setting forth a category of communications link, and an access address for the communications link" which has nothing to do with an identification code for a smart card. Col. 13, lines 45-48. Moreover, even assuming *arguendo* that some language in col. 7, lines 31-66

teaches or suggests performing an action on the smart card, it does not teach that an action is performed "if the identification code of the smart card is listed on the list" as recited in Claim 1 and included by dependency in Claims 2 and 8-9.

Therefore, for all of the above reasons Applicants believe that Claims 1-11 and 21-22 are also in a condition for allowance.

The Applicants believe that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 502117.

**SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:**

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: 22917

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Valerie M. Davis  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 50,203  
Telephone: (847) 576-6733  
Fax No.: (847) 576-0721